

public may access the electronic OMB clearance package by following the directions for electronic access provided in the preamble to the titled rulemaking.

Comments and questions should be directed to the OMB reviewer by May 7, 1997: Edward Michlovich, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, 3150-0002, NEOB-10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, D.C. 20503.

Comments may also be communicated by telephone at (202) 395-3084. The NRC Clearance Officer is Brenda J. Shelton, (301) 415-7233.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 1st day of April, 1997.

Gerald F. Cranford,

Designated Senior Official for Information Resources Management.

[FR Doc. 97-8834 Filed 4-4-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-213]

Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company; (Haddam Neck Plant); Correction to Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission issued a Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment for Facility Operating License No. DPR-61 for the Haddam Neck Plant on March 13, 1997. In the **Federal Register** issue of Monday, March 24, 1997, make the following correction:

On page 13899, first column, last paragraph, the date as issued "this 13th day of March 1997," should have read "this 17th day of March 1997."

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 31st day of March.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

James W. Andersen,

Project Manager, Special Projects Office—Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97-8833 Filed 4-4-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket 70-7001]

Notice of Amendment to Certificate of Compliance GDP-1 for the U.S. Enrichment Corporation Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant Paducah, Kentucky

The Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, has made a determination that the following amendment request is not significant in accordance with 10 CFR 76.45. In making that determination the staff concluded that (1) There is no change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite; (2) there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure; (3) there is no significant construction impact; (4) there is no significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents; (5) the proposed changes do not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident; (6) there is no significant reduction in any margin of safety; and (7) the proposed changes will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety, safeguards or security programs. The basis for this determination for the amendment request is shown below.

The NRC staff has reviewed the certificate amendment application and concluded that it provides reasonable assurance of adequate safety, safeguards, and security, and compliance with NRC requirements. Therefore, the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, is prepared to issue an amendment to the Certificate of Compliance for the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant. The staff has prepared a Compliance Evaluation Report which provides details of the staff's evaluation.

The NRC staff has determined that this amendment satisfies the criteria for a categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for this amendment.

USEC or any person whose interest may be affected may file a petition, not exceeding 30 pages, requesting review of the Director's Decision. The petition must be filed with the Commission not later than 15 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice. A petition for review of the Director's Decision shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner and how that interest may be affected by the results of

the decision. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why review of the Decision should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The interest of the petitioner; (2) how that interest may be affected by the Decision, including the reasons why the petitioner should be permitted a review of the Decision; and (3) the petitioner's areas of concern about the activity that is the subject matter of the Decision. Any person described in this paragraph (USEC or any person who filed a petition) may file a response to any petition for review, not to exceed 30 pages, within 10 days after filing of the petition. If no petition is received within the designated 15-day period, the Director will issue the final amendment to the Certificate of Compliance without further delay. If a petition for review is received, the decision on the amendment application will become final in 60 days, unless the Commission grants the petition for review or otherwise acts within 60 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice.

A petition for review must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC, by the above date.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) The application for amendment and (2) the Commission's Compliance Evaluation Report. These items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC, and at the Local Public Document Room.

Date of amendment request: February 28, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment proposes to add a definition for completion times and to define the maximum interval between repetitive action completion times in the Technical Safety Requirements and to make the same changes to the Safety Analysis Report.

Basis for finding of no significance:

1. The proposed amendment will not result in a change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite.

The proposed amendment to include a definition for completion time and to define the maximum time interval for repetitive actions is an administrative action. As such, these changes have no